Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Fortuna gubernans* (5. 107) has many Greek parallels from Menander to *Anth. Pal.* x. 65.

These suggestions are offered with no captious intention. Professor Merrill has packed his 800 pages with information, and it only remains to thank him for what he has given us.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*L. Annaei Senecae opera quae supersunt.* Volumen II. L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum libros viii edidit ALFRED GERCKE. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1907. Pp. xlvi+278. M. 3.60.

While a new critical edition of all the prose writings of the philosopher Seneca was greatly needed, this was conspicuously true of the *Naturales Quaestiones* on account of the extreme corruption of the text. The edition by Gercke should be welcomed as a valuable aid in the study of one of the interesting chapters in the history of science. The chief value of this edition lies in the information which the preface and the critical apparatus give concerning the manuscripts.

After treating briefly of the time of composition and the division of the work, the editor discusses the order of the eight books. Definite references of Seneca to the order in which different parts of the subject are presented make it probable that Book iii was written before iv *a*, iv *b* before ii, v before vi, vii before i. The attempt, however, to show that the order of the whole was iii, iv*a*; iv*b*, ii, v, vi; vii, i, is far from convincing. It is maintained as certain—and this is the corner-stone of the argument—that the preface of Book iii was the introduction to the whole work. And yet the words of Seneca, if properly interpreted, are just as appropriate an introduction to the third book as to the first. The *fundamenta* of which he speaks refer to his whole work and not to the first part of it. This preface has also been misinterpreted by being put in part into the mouth of Lucilius. The view that 6, 8, 3 and 2, 59, 5 were written after iv*a*, and that 1, 2, 3 was written after 2, 26, 9, and i praef. 13 after 2, 45, 3, rests upon a strained interpretation of the passages compared. In 2, 1, 4, Seneca is speaking of the parts of physical science in general, not of the parts of his own work. The editor, however, is so certain of the correctness of his views that he is not satisfied with presenting them in the preface but renumbers the books in the text. The order of the books is again discussed in the section on their subscriptions and publication, the change from the original order to the present one being ascribed to Seneca himself. But if this is the order in which the author wished the books published, what propriety is there in renumbering them in their published form?

The remainder of the preface is devoted to the history of the work

and to the description and classification of the manuscripts. The discussion of these matters is full and clear. In his zeal to demonstrate that Haase and others attached too much importance to E, the editor is inclined to go to the opposite extreme.

The text is accompanied by references to the ancient authors who made use of the *Naturales Quaestiones* and by a critical apparatus, which shows good judgment in what it gives and omits. An *Index Nominum* and an *Index Testimoniorum* close the volume.

Increased knowledge of the manuscripts and the labors of scholars since Haase have made it possible to improve upon his text in many details. On the other hand, in numerous changes, especially in many of the emendations proposed by the editor himself, there is no improvement over the recension of Haase, which is not yet by any means made superfluous. A large amount of work still remains to be done on the *Naturales Quaestiones.*

FRANK IVAN MERCHANT

IOWA STATE NORMAL SCHOOL

---

*Roman Economic Conditions to the Close of the Republic.* By EDMUND HENRY OLIVER. University of Toronto Library, 1907. Pp. xv+200. $1.50.

This study forms an extra volume in the "University of Toronto Studies in History and Economics." It is a welcome addition to the comparatively few English works on Roman economy and finance. The main division, pp. 41–192, treats of the period from Rome's first Mediterranean expansion to the close of the republic, under four heads: general economic conditions, agriculture, etc., industries, trade and commerce, administration and finance.

In general, the author seems to overrate Roman agriculture and finance and to underestimate the importance of Roman commerce and manufactures. He occasionally combines in one description the statements, e.g., of Cato and Pliny the elder. This seems to be a somewhat questionable mode of procedure. He would have increased the usefulness of the book if he had given modern equivalents for all ancient coins, weights, and measures. He follows the quite common usage of rating the sesterce at about four cents (cf. pp. 159, 160, 165). The Latinists who now make use of the obsolete ratio of 16:1 might be considered belated populists in disguise. So far as the reviewer can see, it is necessary to adopt either the ancient ratio of *ca.* 12:1 or the present market ratio. The former is to be preferred.

A few matters of detail may be noted. On p. 43 the author follows Plutarch's version of the anecdote about the *chlamydes* of Lucullus in preference to that of Horace. On p. 45, 12,000,000 sesterces should be